

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 and 25-27 are pending in the application. Claim 27 is withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11, 19-23, 25, and 26 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, on page 1, lines 30-35 of the specification and in the claims as originally filed.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in the present application. The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-7 and 11-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 is amended to include the limitations of claim 1. Claims 2 and 4-7 are amended to correct lack of antecedent basis for and confusion over "guard means (22)" and "support foot (22)." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 2-7 be allowed.

Claim 11 is amended to recite the limitations of claims 1 and 8-10 and to correct lack of antecedent basis for and confusion over "guard means (22)" and "support foot (22)." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 11-18 be allowed.

Claims 8, 20-22, and 25 are amended to depend from claim 4 to provide antecedent basis for "support foot (22)." Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8. Since claim 4 is indicated as allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 8-10, 20-22, and 25 be allowed.

Claims 19, 23, and 26 are amended to depend from claim 2. Because claim 4 is indicated as allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 19, 23, and 26 be allowed.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The specification is objected to over references to specific claims and lack of proper headings. The specification is amended to remove references to specific claims, provide proper headings for sections of the specification, and to include reference to the claimed priority to a related application. No new matter has been added.

### **Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 1-23, 25, and 26 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph over insufficient antecedent basis for “support foot (22)” in claims 5-18, 20-22, and 25 and confusion between “guard means (22)” and “the support foot (22)” in the claims. The Examiner’s rejection has been carefully considered.

Claims 1, 2, and 4 are amended to remove the recitation of “(22)” after “guard means.” In the specification, the identifier “(22)” is used to identify the “support foot.”

Claim 11 is amended to include the recitation “a guard means designed as a supporting foot (22).” Support for this amendment is found on page 1, lines 30-35 of the specification which reads, in part, “*Because the guard means is designed as a supporting foot ...*”

Claims 8, 20-22, and 25 are amended to depend from claim 4 to provide antecedent basis for “support foot (22).”

Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims overcomes the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1, 8-10, 19-23, 25 and 26 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coffey et al. (US 5,913,645). The Examiner's rejection has been carefully considered.

Claims 8, 20-22, and 25 are amended to depend from claim 4 and claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8. Since claim 4 is not anticipated by Coffey, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims, as amended, be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 23, and 26 are amended to depend from claim 2. Because claim 2 is not anticipated by Coffey, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims, as amended, be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Responsive to Office Action mailed 04/03/2008  
Art Unit 3722

Application Serial No. 10/572,787  
Examiner Dana Ross



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700